arXiv:1406.3464v1 [math.GR] 13 Jun 2014

# Finite groups with all 3-maximal subgroups $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal

Xiaolan Yi *
Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Sci-Tech University,
Hangzhou 310018, P.R.China
E-mail: yixiaolan2005@126.com

Viktoria A. Kovaleva
Department of Mathematics, Francisk Skorina Gomel State University,
Gomel 246019, Belarus
E-mail: vika.kovalyova@rambler.ru

**Abstract**

A classification of finite groups in which every 3-maximal subgroup is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal is given.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all groups are finite and $G$ always denotes a finite group. We use $\mathfrak{U}$ to denote the class of all supersoluble groups; $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ denotes the intersection of all normal subgroups $N$ of $G$ with $G/N \in \mathfrak{U}$. The symbol $\pi(G)$ denotes the set of prime divisors of the order of $G$.

A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is called a 2-*maximal* (*second maximal*) subgroup of $G$ whenever $H$ is a maximal subgroup of some maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$. Similarly we can define 3-*maximal subgroups*, and so on.

One of the interesting and substantial direction in finite group theory consists in studying the relations between the structure of the group and its $n$-maximal subgroups. The earliest publications in this direction are the articles of L. Rédei [1] and B. Huppert [2]. L. Rédei described the nonsoluble groups with abelian second maximal subgroups. B. Huppert established the supersolubility of $G$ whose all second maximal subgroups are normal. In the same article Huppert proved that if all 3-maximal subgroups of $G$ are normal in $G$, then the commutator subgroup $G'$ of $G$ is nilpotent and the chief rank of $G$ is at most 2. These results were developed by many authors. In particular,

*Research of the first author is supported by a NNSF grant of China (Grant # 11101369) and the Science Foundation of Zhejiang Sci–Tech University under grant 1013843-Y.

Keywords: 3-maximal subgroup, $\mathfrak{U}$-normal maximal subgroup, $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal subgroup, $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal subgroup, soluble group, supersoluble group, minimal nonsupersoluble group, $SDH$-group.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 20D10, 20D15, 20D20

L.Ja. Poljakov [3] proved that $G$ is supersoluble if every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is permutable with every maximal subgroup of $G$. He also established the solubility of $G$ in the case when every maximal subgroup of $G$ permutes with every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$. Some later, R.K. Agrawal [4] proved that $G$ is supersoluble if any 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is permutable with every Sylow subgroup of $G$. In [5], Z. Janko described the groups whose 4-maximal subgroups are normal. A description of nonsoluble groups with all 2-maximal subgroups nilpotent was obtained by M. Suzuki [6] and Z. Janko [7]. In [8], T.M. Gagen and Z. Janko gave a description of simple groups whose 3-maximal subgroups are nilpotent. V.A. Belonogov [9] studied those groups in which every 2-maximal subgroup is nilpotent. Continuing this, V.N. Semenchuk [10] obtained a description of soluble groups whose all 2-maximal subgroups are supersoluble. A. Mann [11] studied the structure of the groups whose $n$-maximal subgroups are subnormal. He proved that if all $n$-maximal subgroups of a soluble group $G$ are subnormal and $|\pi(G)| \geq n+1$, then $G$ is nilpotent; but if $|\pi(G)| \geq n-1$, then $G$ is $\phi$-dispersive for some ordering $\phi$ of the set of all primes. Finally, in the case $|\pi(G)| = n$, Mann described $G$ completely. A.E. Spencer [12] studied groups in which every $n$-maximal chain contains a proper subnormal subgroup. In particular, Spencer proved that $G$ is a Schmidt group with abelian Sylow subgroups if every 2-maximal chain of $G$ contains a proper subnormal subgroup.

Among the recent results on $n$-maximal subgroups we can mention the paper of X.Y. Guo and K.P. Shum [13]. In this paper the authors proved that $G$ is soluble if all its 2-maximal subgroups enjoy the cover-avoidance property. W. Guo, K.P. Shum, A.N. Skiba and B. Li [14, 15, 16] gave new characterizations of supersoluble groups in terms of 2-maximal subgroups. Sh. Li [17] obtained a classification of nonnilpotent groups whose all 2-maximal subgroups are $TI$-subgroups. In [18], W. Guo, H.V. Legchekova and A.N. Skiba described the groups whose every 3-maximal subgroup permutes with all maximal subgroups. In [19], W. Guo, Yu.V. Lutsenko and A.N. Skiba gave a description of nonnilpotent groups in which every two 3-maximal subgroups are permutable. Yu.V. Lutsenko and A.N. Skiba [20] obtained a description of the groups whose all 3-maximal subgroups are $S$-quasinormal. Subsequently, this result was strengthened by Yu.V. Lutsenko and A.N. Skiba in [21] to provide a description of the groups whose all 3-maximal subgroups are subnormal. Developing some of the above-mentioned results, W. Guo, D.P. Andreeva and A.N. Skiba [22] obtained a description of the groups in which every 3-maximal chain contains a proper subnormal subgroup. In [23], A. Ballester-Bolinches, L.M. Ezquerro and A.N. Skiba obtained a full classification of the groups in which the second maximal subgroups of the Sylow subgroups cover or avoid the chief factors of some of its chief series. In [24], V.N. Kniahina and V.S. Monakhov studied those groups $G$ in which every $n$-maximal subgroup permutes with each Schmidt subgroup. In partiqular, it was be proved that if $n = 1, 2, 3$, then $G$ is metanilpotent; but if $n \geq 4$ and $G$ is soluble, then the nilpotent length of $G$ is at most $n-1$. In [25], V.A. Kovaleva and A.N. Skiba described the groups whose all $n$-maximal subgroups are $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal. In [26], the authors obtained a description of the groups with all $n$-maximal subgroups $\mathfrak{F}$-subnormal for some saturated formation $\mathfrak{F}$. In [27], V.S. Monakhov and V.N. Kniahina studied the groups with all 2-maximal subgroups $\mathbb{P}$-subnormal.

Recall that a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be: (i) $\mathfrak{U}$-*subnormal* in $G$ if there exists a chain of subgroups $H = H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \cdots \leq H_n = G$ such that $H_i/(H_{i-1})_{H_i} \in \mathfrak{U}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$; (ii) $\mathfrak{U}$-*subnormal in the sense of Kegel* [28] or $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-*subnormal* (see p. 236 in [29]) in $G$ if there exists a chain of subgroups $H = H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \cdots \leq H_t = G$ such that either $H_{i-1}$ is normal in $H_i$ or $H_i/(H_{i-1})_{H_i} \in \mathfrak{U}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, t$. It is evident that every subnormal subgroup is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal. The inverse, in general, it is not true. For example, in the group $S_3$ a subgroup of order 2 is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal and at the same time it is not subnormal. This elementary observation and the results in [21, 22, 25, 26] make natural the following questions:

I. *What is the structure of $G$ under the condition that every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal?*

II. *What is the structure of $G$ under the condition that every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal?*

Before continuing, recall that $G$ is called *a minimal nonsupersoluble group* provided $G$ does not belong to $\mathfrak{U}$ but every proper subgroup of $G$ belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$. Such groups were described by B. Huppert [2] and K. Doerk [30]. We say that $G$ is a *special Doerk-Huppert group* or an *$SDH$-group* if $G$ is a minimal nonsupersoluble group such that $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$.

The solution of the first of the above-mentioned questions originates to [25, 26], where, in particular, the following theorem was proved.

**Theorem A$^*$.** *Every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ if and only if $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group.*

If every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal, then every maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble (see Lemma 2.3 below). Therefore in this case $G$ is either supersoluble or a minimal nonsupersoluble group, hence $G$ is soluble by [2]. Thus we get the following

**Theorem A.** *Every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ if and only if $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group.*

In this paper, on the bases of Theorem A we analyse Question II. Note that since each subgroup of every supersoluble group is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal, we need, in fact, only consider the case when $G$ is not supersoluble. But in this case, in view of [25, Theorem A] or [26, Theorem A], $|\pi(G)| \leq 4$. The following theorems are proved.

**Theorem B** (See Theorem B in [31]). *Let $G$ be a nonsupersoluble group with $|\pi(G)| = 2$. Let $p, q$ be distinct prime divisors of $|G|$ and $G_p$, $G_q$ be Sylow $p$-subgroup and $q$-subgroup of $G$ respectively. Every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ if and only if $G$ is a soluble group of one of the following types:*

I. *$G$ is either a minimal nonsupersoluble group such that $|\Phi(G^{\mathfrak{U}})|$ is a prime or an $SDH$-group.*

II. *$G = G_p \rtimes G_q$, where $G_p$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$ and every 2-maximal subgroup of $G_q$ is an abelian group of exponent dividing $p-1$. Moreover, every maximal subgroup of*

*$G$ containing $G_p$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group and at least one of the maximal subgroups of $G$ is not supersoluble.*

III. *$G = (G_p \times Q_1) \rtimes Q_2$, where $G_q = Q_1 \rtimes Q_2$, $G_p$ and $Q_1$ are minimal normal subgroups of $G$, $|Q_1| = q$, $G_p \rtimes Q_2$ is an $SDH$-group and every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p \rtimes Q_1$ is supersoluble. Moreover, if $p < q$, then every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is nilpotent.*

IV. *$G = G_p \rtimes G_q$, where $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, $O_q(G) \neq 1$, $\Phi(G) \neq 1$, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group and $G/\Phi(G)$ is a group of one of Types II or III.*

V. *$G = (P_1 \times P_2) \rtimes G_q$, where $G_p = P_1 \times P_2$, $P_1$, $P_2$ are minimal normal subgroups of $G$, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$ is supersoluble, $P_1 \rtimes G_q$ is an $SDH$-group and $P_2 \rtimes G_q$ is either an $SDH$-group or a supersoluble group with $|P_2| = p$.*

VI. *$G = G_p \rtimes G_q$, where $\Phi(G_p)$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$ is supersoluble and $\Phi(G_p) \rtimes G_q$ is an $SDH$-group.*

VII. *Each of the subgroups $G_p$ and $G_q$ is not normal in $G$ and the following hold:*

(i) *if $p < q$, then $G = P_1 \rtimes (G_q \rtimes P_2)$, where $G_p = P_1 \rtimes P_2$, $P_1$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, $|P_2| = p$, $G_q = \langle a \rangle$ is a cyclic group and $\langle a^q \rangle$ is normal in $G$. Moreover, $G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups whose representatives are $P_1 \rtimes G_q$, $G_q \rtimes P_2$ and $\langle a^q \rangle \rtimes G_p$, where $P_1 \rtimes G_q$ is an $SDH$-group;*

(ii) *if $p > q$, then $G = P_1(G_q \rtimes P_2)$, where $G_p = P_1P_2$, $P_1$ is a normal subgroup of $G$, $P_2 = \langle b \rangle$ is a cyclic group and $1 \neq P_1 \cap P_2 = \langle b^p \rangle$. Moreover, $G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups whose representatives are $P_1 \rtimes G_q$, $G_q \rtimes P_2$, $G_p$, where $|G : G_q \rtimes P_2| = p$, $P_1 \rtimes G_q$ is a normal supersoluble group and $G_q \rtimes P_2$ is an $SDH$-group.*

**Theorem C.** *Let $G$ be a nonsupersoluble group with $|\pi(G)| = 3$. Let $p, q, r$ be distinct prime divisors of $|G|$ and $G_p$, $G_q$, $G_r$ be Sylow $p$-subgroup, $q$-subgroup and $r$-subgroup of $G$ respectively. Every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ if and only if $G$ is a soluble group of one of the following types:*

I. *$G$ is either a minimal nonsupersoluble group such that $|\Phi(G^{\mathfrak{U}})|$ is a prime or an $SDH$-group.*

II. *$G = G_p \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$, where $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group and at least one of the maximal subgroups of $G$ is not supersoluble. Moreover, the following hold:*

(i) *if $G_p$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$, then every 2-maximal subgroup of $G_q \rtimes G_r$ is an abelian group of exponent dividing $p - 1$;*

(ii) *if $G_q \rtimes G_r$ is an $SDH$-group, then all maximal subgroups of $G$ containing $G_pG_q$ are supersoluble and $G_p \rtimes G_r$ is either an $SDH$-group or a supersoluble group with $|G_p| = p$.*

III. *$G = (P_1 \times P_2) \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$, where $G_p = P_1 \times P_2$, $P_1$ and $P_2$ are minimal normal subgroups*

*of $G$, $G_q$ and $G_r$ are cyclic groups, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$ is supersoluble, $P_1 \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$ is an $SDH$-group and $P_2 \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$ is either an $SDH$-group or a supersoluble group with $|P_2| = p$.*

IV. *$G = G_p \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$, where $\Phi(G_p)$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$ is supersoluble and $\Phi(G_p) \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$ is an $SDH$-group.*

**Theorem D.** *Let $G$ be a nonsupersoluble group with $|\pi(G)| = 4$. Let $p, q, r, t$ be distinct prime divisors of $|G|$ ($p > q > r > t$) and $G_p$, $G_q$, $G_r$, $G_t$ be Sylow $p$-subgroup, $q$-subgroup, $r$-subgroup and $t$-subgroup of $G$ respectively. Every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ if and only if $G = G_p \rtimes (G_q \rtimes (G_r \rtimes G_t))$ is a soluble group such that $G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups whose representatives are $G_qG_rG_t$, $G_pG_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$, $G_pG_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$, $G_p\Phi(G_q)G_rG_t$, and every nonsupersoluble maximal subgroup of $G$ is an $SDH$-group, $G_r$ and $G_t$ are cyclic groups and the following hold:*

(1) *if $G_qG_rG_t$ is an $SDH$-group, then $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_p \times G_q$, $G_q$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, $G_pG_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$ and $G_pG_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$ are supersoluble and $G_pG_rG_t$ is either an $SDH$-group or a supersoluble group with $|G_p| = p$;*

(2) *if $G_qG_rG_t$ is supersoluble, then $G_q$ is cyclic.*

Theorems B, C and D show that the class of the groups with all 3-maximal subgroups $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal is essentially wider then the class of the groups with all 3-maximal subgroups subnormal [21].

All unexplained notation and terminology are standard. The reader is referred to [29], [32] and [33] if necessary.

## 2 Preliminary Results

Let $M$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$. Recall that $M$ is said to be $\mathfrak{U}$-*normal* in $G$ if $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{U}$, otherwise it is said to be $\mathfrak{U}$-*abnormal* in $G$. Note that if $G$ is soluble, then $M$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$ if and only if $|G : M|$ is a prime.

We use the following results.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $H$ and $K$ be subgroups of $G$ such that $H$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.*

(1) *$H \cap K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $K$* [29, 6.1.7(2)].

(2) *If $N$ is a normal subgroup in $G$, then $HN/N$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G/N$* [29, 6.1.6(3)].

(3) *If $K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $H$, then $K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$* [29, 6.1.6(1)].

(4) *If $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq K$, then $K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$* [29, 6.1.7(1)].

The following lemma is evident.

**Lemma 2.2.** *If $G$ is supersoluble, then every subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.*

**Lemma 2.3.** *If every $n$-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$, then every $(n-1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble and every $(n+1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.*

**Proof.** We first show that every $(n-1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble. Let $H$ be an $(n-1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ and $K$ any maximal subgroup of $H$. Then $K$ is an $n$-maximal subgroup of $G$ and so, by hypothesis, $K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Hence $K$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $H$ by Lemma 2.1(1). Therefore either $K$ is normal in $H$ or $H/K_H \in \mathfrak{U}$. If $K$ is normal in $H$, then $|H:K|$ is a prime in view of maximality of $K$ in $H$. Let $H/K_H \in \mathfrak{U}$. Then we also get that $|H:K| = |H/K_H : K/K_H|$ is a prime. Since $K$ is an arbitrary maximal subgroup of $H$, it follows that $H$ is supersoluble.

Now, let $E$ be an $(n+1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$, and let $E_1$ and $E_2$ be an $n$-maximal and an $(n-1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$, respectively, such that $E \leq E_1 \leq E_2$. Then, by the above, $E_2$ is supersoluble, so $E_1$ is supersoluble. Hence $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $E_1$ by Lemma 2.2. By hypothesis, $E_1$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Therefore $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.1(3). The lemma is proved.

Fix some ordering $\phi$ of the set of all primes. The record $p\phi q$ means that $p$ precedes $q$ in $\phi$ and $p \neq q$. Recall that a group $G$ of order $p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}\cdots p_n^{\alpha_n}$ is called *$\phi$-dispersive* whenever $p_1\phi p_2\phi\cdots\phi p_n$ and for every $i$ there is a normal subgroup of $G$ of order $p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}\cdots p_i^{\alpha_i}$. Furthermore, if $\phi$ is such that $p\phi q$ always implies $p > q$, then every $\phi$-dispersive group is called *Ore dispersive*.

**Lemma 2.4** (See [25, Theorems  and C] or [26, Theorems  and D]). *Let $G$ be a soluble group in which every $n$-maximal subgroup is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal. If $|\pi(G)| \geq n$, then $G$ is $\phi$-dispersive for some ordering $\phi$ of the set of all primes. Moreover, if $|\pi(G)| \geq n+1$, then $G$ is Ore dispersive and the followig holds: if $G$ is not supersoluble, then $G = A \rtimes B$, where $A = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ and $B$ are Hall subgroups of $G$, $A$ is either of the form $N_1 \times \cdots \times N_t$, where each $N_i$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, which is a Sylow subgroup of $G$, for $i = 1, \ldots, t$, or a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$ of exponent $p$ for some prime $p$.*

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let $G$ be a minimal nonsupersoluble group. The following hold:*

(1) *$G$ is soluble and $|\pi(G)| \leq 3$* [2];

(2) *if $G$ is not a Schmidt group, then $G$ is Ore dispersive* [2];

(3) *$G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is the unique normal Sylow subgroup of $G$* [2, 30];

(4) *$G^{\mathfrak{U}}/\Phi(G^{\mathfrak{U}})$ is a noncyclic chief factor of $G$* [30];

(5) *if $S$ is a complement of $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ in $G$, then $S/S \cap \Phi(G)$ is either a primary cyclic group or a Miller-Moreno group* [30].

**Lemma 2.6** (See [10, 2]). *Let $G$ be a minimal nonsupersoluble group with $|\pi(G)| = 3$. Let $p_1$, $p_2$, $p_3$ be distinct prime divisors of $|G|$ such that $p_1 > p_2 > p_3$ and $G_{p_i}$ be a Sylow $p_i$-subgroup of $G$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. The following hold:*

1) *$G$ is Ore dispersive and $G_{p_2}, G_{p_3}$ are cyclic;*

2) *$G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups;*

3) *$G_{p_1}/\Phi(G_{p_1}), G_{p_1}G_{p_2}/G_{p_1}\Phi(G_{p_2}), G_{p_1}G_{p_2}G_{p_3}/G_{p_1}G_{p_2}\Phi(G_{p_3})$ are chief factors of $G$.*

**Lemma 2.7.** *If every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$, then $G$ is soluble.*

**Proof.** Suppose that lemma is false and let $G$ be a counterexample with $|G|$ minimal. Since every 3-maximal subgroup of $G$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$, every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble by Lemma 2.3. Hence every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or a minimal nonsupersoluble group. Therefore all proper subgroups of $G$ are soluble in view of Lemma 2.4(1). Assume that all 3-maximal subgroups of $G$ are identity. Then all 2-maximal subgroups of $G$ have prime orderes and so every maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble. Hence $G$ is either supersoluble or a minimal nonsupersoluble group. Thus in view of Lemma 2.4(1), $G$ is soluble, a contradiction. Hence there is a 3-maximal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $T \neq 1$. Since $T$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$, there exists a proper subgroup $H$ of $G$ such that $T \leq H$ and either $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$ or $H$ is normal in $G$. If $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$, then $G$ is soluble in view of solubility of $H_G$, a contradiction. Therefore $H$ is normal in $G$. Let $E/H$ be any 3-maximal subgroup of $G/H$. Then $E$ is a 3-maximal subgroup of $G$, hence $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Hence $E/H$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G/H$ by Lemma 2.1(2). Thus the hypothesis holds for $G/H$. Hence $G/H$ is soluble by the choice of $G$. Therefore $G$ is soluble. This contradiction completes the proof of the lemma.

## 3 Proofs of Theorems C and D

**Proof of Theorem C.** *Necessity.* By Lemma 2.7, $G$ is soluble. Hence every $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal subgroup of $G$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Let $W$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$. In view of hypothesis and Lemma 2.1(1), every 2-maximal subgroup of $W$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $W$. Therefore, by Theorem A, $W$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group. In particular, all 2-maximal subgroups of $G$ are supersoluble.

If all maximal subgroups of $G$ are supersoluble, then $G$ is a minimal nonsupersoluble group. In view of Lemma 2.5(3), $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_t$ is a Sylow $t$-subgroup of $G$ for some prime divisor $t$ of $|G|$. Suppose that $|\Phi(G_t)| \geq t^2$. Let $M$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $G_t \not\leq M$. Then $G = G_tM$ and $M = (G_t \cap M)G_{t'} = \Phi(G_t)G_{t'}$ by Lemma 2.5(4), where $G_{t'}$ is a Hall $t'$-subgroup of $G$. Since $M$ is supersoluble, there is a 2-maximal subgroup $E$ of $M$ such that $|M : E| = t^2$. Hence $M = \Phi(G_t)E$ and so $G = G_tE$. Since $E$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$, there exists a proper subgroup $H$ of $G$ such that $E \leq H$ and $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$. Therefore $G_t \leq H$, hence $G = G_tE \leq H$. This contradiction shows that $|\Phi(G_t)| \leq t$. Thus $G$ is a group of Type I.

Now consider the case when at least one of the maximal subgroups of $G$ is not supersoluble. In view of Lemma 2.4, $G$ is $\phi$-dispersive for some ordering $\phi$ of the set of all primes. We can assume that $G = G_p \rtimes (G_q \rtimes G_r)$.

First suppose that $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Then $M = G_qG_r$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$. Note that if $G_p$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$, then every 2-maximal subgroup of $M$ is an abelian group of exponent dividing $p-1$. Indeed, in this case $F(G) = G_p$. Let $K$ be any 2-maximal subgroup of $G_qG_r$. Then $G_pK$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ and so $G_pK$ is supersoluble. Hence $G_pK/F(G_pK)$ is an abelian group of exponent dividing $p-1$ by [34, 1, 1.5 and Appendixes, 3.2]. Since $C_G(G_p) = C_G(F(G)) \leq F(G) = G_p$, it follows that $C_G(G_p) = G_p$. Therefore $O_q(G_pK) = 1$, hence $F(G_pK) = G_p$. Thus $K \simeq G_pK/G_p = G_pK/F(G_pK)$ is an abelian group of exponent dividing $p-1$.

Suppose that $M$ is an $SDH$-group. Then $G_q = M^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $M$. We show that every maximal subgroup $V$ of $G$ containing $G_pG_q$ is supersoluble. Suppose that $V$ is an $SDH$-group. Then $|\pi(V)| = 2$. Indeed, if $|\pi(V)| > 2$, then $|\pi(V)| = 3$ in view of Lemma 2.5(1). Hence $G_q$ is cyclic by Lemma 2.6(1) and so $G_qG_r$ is supersoluble, a contradiction. Therefore $V = G_pG_q$. Note that $\Phi(G_pG_q) \leq \Phi(G)$ in view of normality of $G_pG_q$ in $G$. Since $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ and $G_q$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $M = G_qG_r$, we have $\Phi(G) \cap G_p = \Phi(G) \cap G_q = 1$. Consequently, $\Phi(G) \leq G_r$ and so $\Phi(V) = \Phi(G_pG_q) = 1$. By Lemma 2.5(5), $G_q$ is either a primary cyclic group or a Miller-Moreno group. Since $G_q$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $M$, $G_q$ is abelian in view of solubility of $M$. Hence $G_q$ is a cyclic group. This contradiction completes the proof of supersolubility of $V$.

Since $G_q$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $M = G_qG_r$, $G_r$ is a maximal subgroup of $M$. Thus $G_pG_r$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$. Finally, show that if $G_pG_r$ is supersoluble, then $|G_p| = p$. Suppose that $G_pG_r$ is supersoluble, but $|G_p| \geq p^2$. In view of solubility of $G$, it follows that $M$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-abnormal in $G$. Since $G_pG_r$ is supersoluble, $G_r$ is a $k$-maximal subgroup of $G_pG_r$ for some $k \geq 2$. Hence $G_r$ is a $(k+1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ and so $G_r$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by hypothesis and Lemma 2.3. Therefore there is a proper subgroup $H$ of $G$ such that $G_r \leq H$ and $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$. Consequently, $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq H$. Moreover, in view of hereditary of $\mathfrak{U}$, $M^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq G^{\mathfrak{U}}$. Hence $M = G_qG_r = M^{\mathfrak{U}}G_r \leq G^{\mathfrak{U}}G_r \leq H$. Since $H$ is a proper subgroup of $G$ and $M$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$, it follows that $M = H$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$. This contradiction shows that $|G_p| = p$. Thus $G$ is a group of Type II.

Now suppose that $G_p$ is not a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Let $W$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $G_p \leq W$. Then $G_p$ is not a minimal normal subgroup of $W$. Therefore $W$ is not an $SDH$-group. Hence $W$ is supersoluble.

Let $\Phi(G_p) = 1$. By Maschke's Theorem, $G_p = P_1 \times P_2$, where $P_1$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ and $P_2$ is a normal subgroup of $G$. Then $M = P_2G_qG_r$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$. We show that $P_2$ is also a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. If $M$ is an $SDH$-group, then $P_2 = M^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $M$, so $P_2$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Assume that $M$ is supersoluble. Then $G/P_1 \simeq M$ is a supersoluble group. If $P_1G_qG_r$ is supersoluble, then $G/P_2 \simeq P_1G_qG_r$ is supersoluble and hence $G$ is supersoluble, a contradiction. Thus $P_1G_qG_r$ is not a supersoluble group. But every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble. Hence $P_1G_qG_r$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$, so $P_2$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$.

Since $G$ is not supersoluble, at least one of the subgroups $M = P_2G_qG_r$ or $L = P_1G_qG_r$ is not supersoluble. Let $L$ be an $SDH$-group. Then in view of Lemma 2.6(1), $G_q$ and $G_r$ are cyclic. We show also that if $M$ is supersoluble, then $|P_2| = p$. Suppose that $|P_2| \geq p^2$. Then $L$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-abnormal in $G$. Note also that $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = P_1$ since $G/P_1 \simeq M$ is supersoluble. Since $|P_2| \geq p^2$ and $M$ is supersoluble, $G_qG_r$ is a $k$-maximal subgroup of $M$, where $k \geq 2$. Hence $G_qG_r$ is a $(k+1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$ and so $G_qG_r$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by hypothesis and Lemma 2.3. Let $H$ be a proper subgroup of $G$ such that $G_qG_r \leq H$ and $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$. Then $P_1 = G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq H$, hence $L = P_1G_qG_r \leq H$. Since $H$ is a proper subgroup of $G$ and $L$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$, it follows that $L = H$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal subgroup of $G$. This contradiction shows that $|P_2| = p$. Thus $G$ is a group of Type III.

Let now $\Phi(G_p) \neq 1$. By the above, all maximal subgroups of $G$ containing $G_p$ are supersoluble. Since $G$ is not a minimal nonsupersoluble group, there is a maximal subgroup $U$ of $G$ such that $G_p \not\leq U$ and $U$ is an $SDH$-group. Let $U_p$ be a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $U$. Then $U_p = G_p \cap U$ is normal in $U$ and so $U_p = U^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $U$. But since $1 \neq \Phi(G_p) \leq U_p$ and $\Phi(G_p)$ is normal in $U$, it follows that $\Phi(G_p) = U_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $U$. Therefore $\Phi(G_p)$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Thus $G$ is a group of Type IV.

*Sufficiency.* Let $E$ be any 3-maximal subgroup of $G$. Let $M$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $E$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $M$. Since $G$ is a group of one of Types I–IV, every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group. In particular, in view of Lemma 2.2 and Theorem A, $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $M$. If $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq M$, then in this case $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.1(3)(4).

Suppose that $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \not\leq M$. Let $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E$. In view of Lemma 2.1(4), $D$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. If $G$ is a group of Type I, then $D$ is supersoluble and so $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $D$ by Lemma 2.2. Hence $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.1(3).

Let $G$ be a group of Type II. First assume that $G_qG_r$ is supersoluble. Then $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_p$ and so $M = G/G^{\mathfrak{U}} \simeq G_qG_r$. Since $E$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $M$, $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E = G_pE$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $G$. Since every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group, every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble. Therefore $D$ is supersoluble. As abovei t follows that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.

Now assume that $G_qG_r$ is an $SDH$-group. In view of Lemma 2.5(4), $|G_q| \geq q^2$. Hence $G_pG_r$ is an $\mathfrak{U}$-abnormal subgroup of $G$ in view of solubility of $G$. Suppose that $G_pG_r$ is supersoluble. Then $|G_p| = p$, hence $G_qG_r$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$. Consequently, $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq G_qG_r$. It is easy to see that every maximal subgroup $W$ of $G$ such that $G_pG_q \leq W$ is normal in $G$. Therefore $W$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$. Hence $M = G_pG_r^x$ for some $x \in G$. In view of supersolubility of $M$, $E$ is one of the subgroups $R_1$ or $G_pR_2$, where $R_1$ is a maximal subgroup of $G_r^x$ and $R_2$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $G_r^x$. Thus $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E \leq G_pG_qR$, where $R$ is a maximal subgroup of $G_r^x$. Since every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_pG_q$ is supersoluble, $D$ is supersoluble. Consequently, arguing as above we get that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.

Finally, suppose that $G_pG_r$ is an $SDH$-group. Then $|G_p| \geq p^2$ by Lemma 2.5(4) and so $G_qG_r$ is an $\mathfrak{U}$-abnormal subgroup of $G$. By the above, every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_pG_q$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$. Therefore we can assume that $M$ is one of the subgroups $G_pG_r$ or $G_qG_r$. Let $M = G_pG_r$. Then $E$ is one of the subgroups $R$, $PR$ or $PR_1$, where $P$ is a maximal subgroup of $G_p$, $R$ is a maximal subgroup of $G_r$ and $R_1$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $G_r$. In all these cases we get that there is a maximal subgroup $W$ of $G$ such that $G_pG_q \leq W$ and $E \leq W$. Since $W$ is supersoluble, as above it follows that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Arguing as above we get also that in the case when $M = G_qG_r$, $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.

Let $G$ be a group of one of Types III or IV. Then $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq G_p$. In view of supersolubility of every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$, $D \leq G_pE$ is supersoluble. Therefore as above we get that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. The theorem is proved.

**Proof of Theorem D.** *Necessity.* By Lemma 2.7, $G$ is soluble. Hence every $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal subgroup of $G$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. As in the proof of Theorem C we get that every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group. In particular, all 2-maximal subgroups of $G$ are supersoluble. If all maximal subgroups of $G$ are supersoluble, then $G$ is a minimal nonsupersoluble group and so $|\pi(G)| = 3$ by Lemma 2.5(1). This contradiction shows that at least one of the maximal subgroups of $G$ is an $SDH$-group.

By Lemma 2.4, $G$ is Ore dispersive. Therefore $G = G_p \rtimes (G_q \rtimes (G_r \rtimes G_t))$. We show that $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Suppose that $G_p$ is not a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. Let $M$ be any maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $G_p \not\leq M$. Since $G_p$ is not a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, $M \cap G_p \neq 1$ and so $|\pi(M)| = 4$. Hence $M$ is supersoluble in view of Lemma 2.5(1). Let $L$ be any maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_p$. If $L$ is an $SDH$-group, then $G_p = L^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $L$. It follows that $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, a contradiction. Consequently, $L$ is supersoluble. Thus all maximal subgroups of $G$ are supersoluble. This contradiction shows that $G_p$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$. In particular, it follows that all maximal subgroups of $G$ containing no $G_p$ are pairwise conjugate in $G$.

Let $W = G_qG_rG_t$. First suppose that $W$ is an $SDH$-group. Then $G_q = W^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $W$. Since $G/G_pG_q \simeq G_rG_t \in \mathfrak{U}$ and $G/G_p \simeq G_qG_rG_t = W$ is not supersoluble, $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_pG_q$ in view of Lemma 2.4. Moreover, $G_q$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ by Lemma 2.4. Note also that every maximal subgroup of $G$ containing $G_pG_q$ is supersoluble in view of Lemma 2.5(3).

By Lemma 2.6, $G_r$ and $G_t$ are cyclic and $W$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups whose representatives are $G_rG_t$, $G_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$ and $G_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$. Hence $G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups containing $G_p$ whose representatives are $G_pG_rG_t$, $G_pG_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$ and $G_pG_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$. Suppose that $G_pG_rG_t$ is supersoluble. We show that in this case $|G_p| = p$. Indeed, if $|G_p| \geq p^2$, then $G_rG_t$ is a $k$-maximal subgroup of $G_pG_rG_t$ ($k \geq 2$) in view of supersolubility of $G_pG_rG_t$. Hence $G_rG_t$ is a $(k+1)$-maximal subgroup of $G$. Thus $G_rG_t$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by hypothesis and Lemma

2.3. Therefore there is a proper subgroup $H$ of $G$ such that $G_rG_t \leq H$ and $G/H_G \in \mathfrak{U}$. Then $G_pG_q = G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq H$ and so $G = G_pG_qG_rG_t \leq H$. This contradiction shows that $|G_p| = p$.

Now suppose that $W = G_qG_rG_t$ is supersoluble. In this case $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_p$. Since $G$ is not a minimal nonsupersoluble group, there exists a maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$ such that $G_p \leq M$ and $M$ is an $SDH$-group. Since $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_p \leq M$, $M$ is $\mathfrak{U}$-normal in $G$. Hence $|G : M|$ is a prime. Moreover, in view of solubility of $G$ and Lemma 2.5(1), $|\pi(M)| = 3$. If $|G : M| = t$, then by the above $|G_t| = t$. Furthermore, $G_q$ and $G_r$ are cyclic by Lemma 2.6(1). Arguing as above we get that in the cases $|G : M| = q$ and $|G : M| = r$ the subgroups $G_q$, $G_r$ and $G_t$ are cyclic. Hence $W$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups whose representatives are $\Phi(G_q)G_rG_t$, $G_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$ and $G_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$. Therefore $G$ has precisely three classes of maximal subgroups containing $G_p$ whose representatives are $G_p\Phi(G_q)G_rG_t$, $G_pG_qG_r\Phi(G_t)$ and $G_pG_q\Phi(G_r)G_t$.

*Sufficiency.* Let $E$ be any 3-maximal subgroup of $G$. Let $M$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $E$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $M$. Since every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group, $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $M$ by Lemma 2.2 and Theorem A. Hence in the case when $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq M$, $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.1(3)(4).

Suppose that $G^{\mathfrak{U}} \not\leq M$. Let $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E$. By Lemma 2.1(4), $D$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.

Assume that $G_qG_rG_t$ is an $SDH$-group. In this case $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_pG_q$ and so we can assume that $M$ is one of the subgroups $G_qG_rG_t$ or $G_pG_rG_t$. If $M = G_qG_rG_t$, then $M$ is an $SDH$-group. Hence $|M : E|$ is divisible by at least one of the numbers $r$ or $t$. Therefore there is a maximal subgroup $W$ of $G$ such that $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E = G_pG_qE \leq W$. By hypothesis, $W$ is supersoluble and so $D$ is supersoluble. Consequently, $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $D$ by Lemma 2.2. Therefore $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.1(3). Let $M = G_pG_rG_t$. If $M$ is an $SDH$-group, then as above we have that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. Suppose that $M$ is supersoluble. Then $|G_p| = p$ and so $|M : E|$ is divisible by at least one of the numbers $r$ or $t$. Therefore arguing as above we get that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$.

Let now $G_qG_rG_t$ is supersoluble. Then $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = G_p$. Therefore we can asume that $M = G_qG_rG_t$. Since $E$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $M$, $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}E = G_pE$ is a 2-maximal subgroup of $G$. Since every maximal subgroup of $G$ is either supersoluble or an $SDH$-group, every 2-maximal subgroup of $G$ is supersoluble. Therefore $D$ is supersoluble and so as above we get that $E$ is $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal in $G$. The theorem is proved.

Note that the classes of groups which are described in Theorems B, C, and D are pairwise disjoint. It is easy to construct examples to show that all these classes are not empty.

## References

[1] L. Rédei, "Ein Satz uber die endlichen einfachen Gruppen", *Acta Math.*, **84** (1950), 129–153.

[2] B. Huppert, "Normalteiler and maximale Untergruppen endlicher Gruppen", *Math. Z.*, **60** (1954), 409–434.

[3] L.Ja. Poljakov, "Finite groups with permutable subgroups", in *Proc. Gomel Sem.: Finite groups*, Nauka i Tekhnika, Minsk, 1966, 75–88.

[4] R.K. Agrawal, "Generalized center and hypercenter of a finite group", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **54** (1976), 13–21.

[5] Z. Janko, "Finite groups with invariant fourth maximal subgroups", *Math. Zeitschr.*, **82** (1963), 82–89.

[6] M. Suzuki, "The nonexistence of a certain type of simple groups of odd order", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **8**(4) (1957), 686–695.

[7] Z. Janko, "Endliche Gruppen mit lauter nilpotent zweitmaximalen Untergruppen", *Math. Z.*, **79** (1962), 422–424.

[8] T.M. Gagen, Z. Janko, "Finite simple groups with nilpotent third maximal subgroups", *J. Austral. Math. Soc.*, **6**(4) (1966), 466–469.

[9] V.A. Belonogov, "Finite soluble groups with nilpotent 2-maximal subgroups", *Math. Notes*, **3**(1) (1968), 15–21.

[10] V.N. Semenchuk, "Soluble groups with supersoluble second maximal subgroup", *Voprosy Algebry*, **1** (1985), 86–96.

[11] A. Mann, "Finite groups whose $n$-maximal subgroups are subnormal", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **132** (1968), 395–409.

[12] A.E Spencer, "Maximal nonnormal chains in finite groups", *Pacific J. of Math.*, **27**(1) (1968), 167–173.

[13] X.Y. Guo, K.P. Shum, "Cover-avoidance properties and the structure of finite groups", *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **181** (2003), 297–308.

[14] W. Guo, K.P. Shum, A.N. Skiba, "$X$-Semipermutable subgroups of finite groups", *J. Algebra*, **315** (2007), 31–41.

[15] B. Li, A.N. Skiba, "New characterizations of finite supersoluble groups", *Sci. China Ser. A: Math.*, **50**(1) (2008), 827–841.

[16] W. Guo, A.N. Skiba, "Finite groups with given $s$-embedded and $n$-embedded subgroups", *J. Algebra*, **321** (2009), 2843–2860.

[17] Sh. Li, "Finite non-nilpotent groups all of whose second maximal subgroups are $TI$-groups", *Math. Proc. of the Royal Irish Academy*, **100A**(1) (2000), 65–71.

[18] W. Guo, E.V. Legchekova, A.N. Skiba, "Finite groups in which every 3-maximal subgroup commutes with all maximal subgroups", *Math. Notes*, **86**(3–4) (2009), 325–332.

[19] W. Guo, Yu.V. Lutsenko, A.N. Skiba, "On nonnilpotent groups with every two 3-maximal subgroups permutable", *Siberian Math. J.*, **50**(6) (2009), 988–997.

[20] Yu.V. Lutsenko, A.N. Skiba, "Structure of finite groups with $S$-quasinormal third maximal subgroups", *Ukrainian Math. J.*, **61**(12) (2009), 1915–1922.

[21] Yu.V. Lutsenko, A.N. Skiba, "Finite groups with subnormal second and third maximal subgroups", *Math. Notes*, **91**(5) (2012), 680–688.

[22] W. Guo, D.P. Andreeva, A.N. Skiba, "Finite groups of Spencer hight $\leq 3$", *Algebra Colloquium*, (in Press).

[23] A. Ballester-Bolinches, L.M. Ezquerro, A.N. Skiba, "On second maximal subgroups of Sylow subgroups of finite groups", *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **215**(4) (2011), 705–714.

[24] V.N. Kniahina, V.S. Monakhov, "On the permutability of $n$-maximal subgroups with Schmidt subgroups", *Trudy Inst. Mat. i Mekh. UrO RAN*, **18**(3) (2012), 125–130.

[25] V.A. Kovaleva, A.N. Skiba, "Finite solvable groups with all $n$-maximal subgroups $\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal", *Sib. Math. J.*, **54**(1) (2013), 65–73.

[26] V.A. Kovaleva, A.N. Skiba, "Finite soluble groups with all $n$-maximal subgroups $\mathfrak{F}$-subnormal", *J. Group Theory*, **17** (2014), 273–290.

[27] V.S. Monakhov, V.N. Kniahina, "Finite groups with $\mathbb{P}$-subnormal subgroups", *Ricerche di Matematica*, **62**(2) (2013), 307–322.

[28] O.H. Kegel, "Zur Struktur mehrfach faktorisierbarer endlicher Gruppen", *Math. Z.*, **87** (1965), 409–434.

[29] A. Ballester-Bolinches, L.M. Ezquerro, *Classes of Finite Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Dordrecht, 2006.

[30] K. Doerk, "Minimal nicht uberauflosbare, endliche Gruppen", *Math. Z.*, **91** (1966), 198–205.

[31] Xiaolan Yi, V.A. Kovaleva, "Finite biprimary groups with all 3-maximal subgroups $K$-$\mathfrak{U}$-subnormal", *Acta Math. Hung."* (submitted).

[32] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1992.

[33] W. Guo, *The Theory of Classes of Groups*, Science Press-Kluwer Academic Publishers, Beijin-New York-Dordrecht-Boston-London, 2000.

[34] M. Weinstein (ed.), etc, *Between Nilpotent and Solvable*, Polygonal Publishing House, Passaic N.J., 1982.